

# IDAHO EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

## OFFICIAL MINUTES

---

April 7, 2005

A meeting of the Idaho Emergency Communications Commission (IECC) was held on this date at the Department of Health and Welfare, 601 Pole Line Road, Twin Falls, Idaho. Chairman Nancolas called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m.

### **Members Present:**

Garret Nancolas, Mayor, City of Caldwell, Commission Chairman  
Rich Wills, State Representative and Commission Vice-Chairman  
Greg Vickers, Idaho Emergency Medical Services Association  
Matt Beebe, Commissioner, Canyon County Commission  
R. David Moore, Blackfoot Police Chief, Commission Treasurer  
Teresa Baker, Ada County Prosecutor's Office  
Clint Berry, Qwest, Boise  
Joanna Guilfooy, Deputy Attorney General and Ex-Officio Member  
Dia Gainor, Chief, Idaho Bureau of Emergency Medical Services (EMS)  
Bill Bishop, Director, Bureau of Homeland Security (BHS)  
Ben Estes, Retired Chief, Pocatello Fire Department  
Gary Aman, Owyhee County Sheriff  
Jim Lemm, J&R Electronics, Inc., Coeur d'Alene

### **Members Absent:**

Ann Cronin, Special Assistant, Idaho State Police (ISP), Commission Secretary

### **Others Present:**

Pam Ahrens, Director, Department of Administration (DoA)  
Joe Roche, Department of Administration  
Lex Rutter, Department of Administration  
Scot Maring, Department of Administration  
Lorraine Elfering, Canyon County South

## **Approval of Minutes**

**MOTION: Commissioner Baker moved and Commissioner Estes seconded that the Commission approve the minutes of the March 3, 2005 Idaho Emergency Communications Commission meeting as written. The motion passed unanimously.**

## **Financial Reports**

### **Operating Budget**

Commissioner Moore, IECC Treasurer, presented the financial report as prepared by Mr. Rick Thompson, DoA's Internal Management Systems Administrator. Upon reviewing the money received to date from each county, Commissioner Moore stated that the amounts look low. Scot Maring, DoA's staff support to the IECC, explained that money had been received from all but seven (7) counties. Four (4) counties do not collect E911 fees. Money from Caribou County (\$170.82) had been received in April but was not reflected since the spreadsheet only reports up through the end of March, Shoshone County had stated that their check was in the mail, and the DoA fiscal staff was still trying to contact Lincoln County. Commissioner Moore further stated he felt the amount of money collected was too low for his county and for Canyon County and asked if a comparison had been completed showing projected versus actual income received. Scot Maring stated that a comparison had not been completed. Director Ahrens added that one would be completed for the next meeting.

**MOTION: Commissioner Moore moved and Commissioner Beebe seconded that the financial report be accepted. The motion passed unanimously.**

## **Rules for Distribution of Funds**

Commissioner Guilfooy, member of the Operating Procedures Committee, presented a draft set of rules for discussion. She stated that she had begun with the rules used by Emergency Medical Services (EMS), had taken out that which was not applicable, and had adapted it for the IECC to consider and discuss.

Upon review, Chairman Nancolas asked if the draft rules covered procedures to use if funds were not used properly and the money had to be returned. Commissioner Bishop responded that this is usually a condition of the grant, a part of the subgrant process, and a part of the paperwork that an agency receiving money would sign.

Commissioner Gainor then presented a PowerPoint presentation on what went into developing the EMS rules and how the rules have evolved over the past six (6) years of use. Presentation covered the following topics:

- Criteria for Distribution
- Measurable "Need" Factors and how they arrived at:

- Criteria that quantitatively define need
  - Weighting of the criteria amongst themselves
- The result was a system of assigned values to be utilized as a source of discrimination between applicants for grant funding

Follow-on discussion brought out the following points:

- EMS used a task force to brainstorm the list of categories and characteristics to be used and through a consensus process determined how to weight the issues for comparing values.
- Each year the EMS applications are graded on a curve. Norm-referenced calculations allow for conversion to a scale of available points. Awards are then determined by comparing totals.
- EMS's intent was to minimize verbal input. Requiring a written narrative serves the purpose. The IECC could use this procedure and then ask questions of the applicants if needed.
- With this point system, having a tie was never an issue for EMS.
- Keeping the weighting of criteria appropriate is necessary so that one criterion does not overpower others.
- Documentation of expenses/proof of payment procedures must be included in the IECC rules.
- IECC rules must work within the statutes.
- A good definition of consolidation is needed. Discussion covered whether consolidation should be within a county, be of multiple counties, or be based on overlapping coverage. It was agreed that the intent of consolidation is to reduce duplication and therefore save costs.

Chairman Nancolas then stated that Rules for Distribution of Funds would be a topic at the next meeting. As an assignment the Commissioners were to look at the draft rules and Commissioner Gainor's presentation and come to the next meeting prepared to discuss concerns. Commissioner Gainor added that they need to be able to brainstorm criteria also.

## **Needs Assessment Survey**

Commissioner Baker, Chair of the Needs Assessment Committee, reported that not quite 50% of the responses had been received from the Needs Assessment Survey and that follow-up phone calls would begin. Some responses received were good and some were incomplete. A report on the results would be presented at the May meeting.

Commissioner Moore added that if the Commissioners could receive a list of those not responding, they would assist in following up. Commissioner Baker will provide the list to the Commission.

## **Review Action Items/Next Steps**

Chairman Nancolas discussed the list of action items and pointed out that we are in the middle of several items. Our rules are dynamic and suggested improvements can be made as we learn. Our next steps are updating and completing the mediation rules and all of our Operational Procedures, completing our grant application rules, and making our temporary rules permanent.

Commissioner Guilfoxy asked the question of how much money is needed for the Commission to begin the grant application process and Commissioner Wills asked how often we will be performing the grant process. Commissioner Gainor responded that the EMS grant process is done annually and that they do a one-, two-, and three-year projection of collections based on the state budget and information from the counties. Chairman Nancolas stated that this information would be helpful in developing our rules so that everyone knows the application deadlines, timeframes, and when money would be awarded. He then asked Director Ahrens if the DoA could provide any guidance. Director Ahrens stated that this would be discussed with the Division of Financial Management and that the DoA would look at determining what would work best from a tracking stand point.

## **New Business**

### **Future Meeting Coordination**

Scot Maring summarized the travel plans for the May 4<sup>th</sup> meeting in Coeur d'Alene. Those flying will arrive in Coeur d'Alene late morning and a 15-passenger van will be rented for local transportation needs. The meeting is scheduled 2:00 – 5:00 p.m. at North Idaho College's Student Union Building. Return flight is the morning of May 5<sup>th</sup>. Travel orders, flight information, and hotel confirmations were then passed out.

Scot Maring also discussed travel expense vouchers and what information is required on the vouchers for the Commissioners to be reimbursed. In addition to travel information, home addresses are needed so that checks are mailed to the correct locations and license plate numbers are needed if claiming mileage.

**MOTION: After discussion, Commissioner Gainor moved and Commissioner Bishop seconded that the start time for the June and July meetings in Boise will be 1:00 p.m. The motion passed unanimously.**

The date, time, and location of the August meeting could possibly coincide with the Association of Idaho Counties meeting and will be discussed at the next meeting.

## Open Comment Period

After there were no comments from the audience, discussion moved to procedures for the mediation to follow that afternoon. It was decided that the order would be:

- Chairman Nancolas makes introductions and discusses procedures.
- Commissioner Guilfooy reviews the Commission's role as stated in Statutes and reviews the mediation rules as found in the Rules Governing the Idaho Emergency Communications Commission.
- Each party gives presentation (Twin Falls County, City of Kimberly, followed by City of Buhl).
- Commissioners can ask questions at any time.
- Open Mediation.
- Each party gives rebuttal (Twin Falls County, City of Kimberly, followed by City of Buhl).
- Commission makes recommendation/presents finding or takes under advisement and comes back at a later date with decision in order to give direction to those who asked for mediation.

## Adjournment

**MOTION:** It was moved by Commissioner Aman and seconded by Commissioner Beebe to adjourn the April 7, 2005 Idaho Emergency Communications Commission meeting at 11:45 a.m. The motion passed unanimously.

---

Mayor Garret Nancolas, Chairman  
Idaho E911 Emergency Communications Commission

---

Scot R. Maring, Administrative Assistant  
Department of Administration

## **Addendum: Commission Progress on its Prioritized Activities**

### **Funding**

~~Portion of 1% to be assessed (4 votes)~~  
How to fund the “have-nots” (2 votes)  
Sub-optimize by city?  
~~Grant funding resources~~  
Commission (ECC) funding/budget (1 vote)  
Recommendation/advice on E911 spending  
(ECC needs to decide scope)  
Proactive to fund more than systems  
(e.g. services, training, implementation)  
(How will Title 31 money be used)  
~~Federal funds application process~~  
(track, assess, audit, measure)  
Fee collection vs. ECC assistance  
(City must vote in fees)  
Statewide E911 procurement contracts  
(Mutual needs buying power)  
Conduit for funding

### **Systems**

Scope of system—ECC role (equip, people)  
Money for infrastructure  
System implementation  
(technical issue, project management)  
Technical resources  
Who defines architecture, and how do we  
use and leverage systems  
Need to understand baseline (education)  
Identify technical resources & leverage  
Regulate and consolidate systems  
System interoperability standards  
Business continuity—backup/recovery  
Standards to engage vendors  
Define minimum standards for system,  
vendors (including purchasing)  
Standards for a consolidated emergency  
communication system

### **Evaluation/Assessment**

What is the baseline by County (as-is) (5 votes)  
Leverage Office of Disaster Preparedness survey  
Evaluate current standards  
Recommend model – performance indicators  
Establish “to-be” baseline

### **Governance**

~~Cooperation—PSAP representation~~  
~~Know statutory responsibilities (1 vote)~~  
~~ECC by laws, committees (10 votes)~~  
~~Guidelines for operations~~  
Define level of mediation funding  
Recommend model org. structure  
ECC focus on all areas  
(Clearinghouse for E911 assistance)  
Long-term vision  
(systems, organizations, processes)  
Short-term tactical plan  
ECC statewide representation  
~~Acquire wireless representative member~~  
~~Mediation Standards/Criteria~~  
ECC staff support (1 vote)  
Stay focused on mission  
Rules for distributing moneys

### **Education/Information**

~~How will the 1% assessment be used~~  
E911 need for money, improvements  
Promote cohesive, solidarity,  
interoperability, statewide cooperation  
SIEC et. al.--standard definitions  
Communicate—who’s doing what?  
Message: consolidate, coordinate,  
funding, standards, leverage, etc.  
May conflict with autonomy.  
~~Tech. Educ. of ECC members (9 votes)~~